



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,523	08/17/2001	Dan-Cheng Kong	2001B078	4274
23455	7590	01/27/2004	EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY			PATTERSON, MARC A	
P O BOX 2149			ART UNIT	
BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/932,523

Applicant(s)

KONG, DAN-CHENG

Examiner

Marc A Patterson

Art Unit

1772

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.Claim(s) objected to: none.Claim(s) rejected: 23-39.Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See attached.

**ADVISORY ACTION**  
**WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS**

1. The 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection of Claims 25 – 26 and 37, of record on page 3 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 30 – 31 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199), of record on page 4 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 27 and 36 – 39 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199) in view of Tokushige et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,866,634), of record on page 5 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 28 – 29 and 32 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199) in view of Tokushige et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,866,634) and further in view of Ikado et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,766,748), of record on page 6 of the previous Action, is withdrawn.

**ANSWERS TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS**

2. Applicant's arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph rejection of Claims 25 – 26 and 37, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 30 – 31 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199), 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 27 and 36 – 39 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199) in view of Tokushige et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,866,634) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of Claims 28 – 29 and 32 as being unpatentable over McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,883,199) in view of Tokushige et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,866,634) and further in view of Ikado et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,766,748), of record in

Art Unit: 1772

the previous Action, have been carefully considered but have not been found to be persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant argues, on page 6 of Paper No. 11, that the rejection is moot because a toughening additive comprising polybutylene succinate / adipate has been deleted from amended Claim 23. However, the claims prior to amendment did not exclude polybutylene succinate / adipate. The amendment therefore raises new issues, which to be completely addressed would require further search and consideration, and the amendment therefore has not been entered. Even if the amendment was entered, the amended claim would not overcome the rejection because McCarthy et al teach that polyethylene succinate is equivalent to polybutylene succinate / adipate as a toughening additive (column 2, lines 39 – 45).

Applicant also argues, on page 7, that McCarthy's disclosure of a film laminated with paper is not within the scope of the claims. However, as stated on page 3 of the previous Action, McCarthy et al disclose the use of the polymer film to make laminated papers, which clearly reads on layers of the film laminated with paper.

### ***Conclusion***


3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Patterson, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3537. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold

Art Unit: 1772

Pyon, can be reached at (703) 308-4251. FAX communications should be sent to (703) 872-9310. FAXs received after 4 P.M. will not be processed until the following business day.

Marc A. Patterson, PhD.

*Marc Patterson*  
Art Unit 1772

  
HAROLD PYON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
1772

1/22/04